	Case 5:11-cv-00016-LHK	Document 249	Filed 05/13/14	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	IN THE UNITED OT ATEC DISTRICT COURT				
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
11	MARK ROBERT QUIROZ,) No. C	C 11-0016 LHK (I	PR)	
12	Plaintiff,		ER DENYING M		
13	v.) SUM	IISS AND MOTION FOR MARY JUDGMENT HOUT PREJUDICE		
14	WILLIAMS CATE, et al.,)	ket No. 206)	ÇE.	
15	Defendants.) (D00)	Ket 110. 200)		
16	-				
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42				
18	U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that defendants violated his constitutional rights. On October 29, 2013,				
19	most of the defendants filed a motion to dismiss for failure to exhaust along with a motion for				
20	summary judgment. However, the Ninth Circuit recently overruled Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d				
21	1108, 1119 (9th Cir. 2003), which held that failure to exhaust available administrative remedies				
22	under the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a) ("PLRA"), should be raised by a				
23	defendant as an unenumerated Rule 12(b) motion. Albino v. Baca, No. 10-55702, 2014 WL				
24	1317141, at *1 (9th Cir. Apr. 3, 2014) (en banc). "[A] failure to exhaust is more appropriately				
25	handled under the framework of the existing rules than under an 'unenumerated' (that is, non-				
26	existent) rule." Id.				
27	Under the new law of the circuit, in the rare event that a failure to exhaust is clear on the				
28	face of the complaint, a defendant may move for dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6). <i>Id.</i> Otherwise,				
	Order Denying Motion to Dismiss and Motion for Summary Judgment without Prejudice P:\PRO-SE\LHK\CR.11\Quiroz016denalbinomisc.wpd				

Case 5:11-cv-00016-LHK Document 249 Filed 05/13/14 Page 2 of 2

defendants must produce evidence proving failure to exhaust in a motion for summary judgment under Rule 56. *Id.* Defendants must present probative evidence that there was an available administrative remedy and that the prisoner did not exhaust that available administrative remedy. *Id.* at *5, *8.

In view of *Albino*, defendants' motion to dismiss this action under the unenumerated portion of Rule 12(b) for failure to exhaust available administrative remedies, as required by the PLRA, is DENIED. As a matter of efficiency, defendants' motion for summary judgment, which is presented in the same pleading, is also DENIED. These denials are without prejudice to defendants renewing their failure to exhaust defense in a comprehensive motion for summary judgment, if appropriate.

In order to expedite these proceedings, defendants must serve and file a motion for summary judgment (whether or not they choose to raise a failure to exhaust defense) within 30 days of this order. Plaintiff must serve and file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to the motion not more than 28 days after the motion is served and filed, and defendants must serve and file a reply to an opposition not more than 14 days after the opposition is served and filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/12/14

LUCY H. KOH

United States District Judge